



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

be applied to the finding of gold, which is not "lost" property, when such gold was found not by virtue of the servant's employment but by mere accident.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—POLICE POWERS—DISORDERLY HOUSES—MISDEMEANOR—TRIAL BY JURY.—*OGDEN V. CITY OF MADISON*, 87 N. W. 568 (Wis.).—Francis Ogden was convicted of keeping a disorderly house in violation of an ordinance of the City of Madison. He was tried in the municipal court without jury, in accordance with the ordinance, and from this he appealed. *Held*, that such trial was not in violation of the state and United States Constitution.

The court reasons that the offense here charged is entirely distinct from the common law misdemeanor of keeping a disorderly house, which is an offense against a different sovereignty and it is for this latter alone that the state guarantees a trial by jury. This doctrine is by no means settled, many courts holding that where there is both a state and a municipal law as to the same thing, conviction under one would be a bar to the other, and if this theory, which certainly seems sound, is to be accepted, it follows that the constitution applies to both. *State v. Cowan*, 29 Mo. 330; *State v. Municipal Court*, 89 Wis. 358, 61 N. W. 1100.

NEGLIGENCE—CHILDREN—TRESPASSERS—LICENSE OR INVITATION—ATTRACTIVE MACHINERY.—*RYAN V. TOWAR*, 87 N. W. (Mich.) 644.—Action for personal injuries. Judgment for defendant. Appeal. Affirmed. The plaintiff, a girl between 12 and 13 years old, and her younger sister went onto the land of the defendant. On the premises was a house containing a disused overshot wheel. Plaintiff's little sister, while playing with the wheel, got caught between the wheel and the wheel pit, and the plaintiff while rescuing her, became injured. Defendants had never taken any particular steps to stop children from coming onto their premises. *Held*, since plaintiff was a trespasser, defendant owed no duty to her and trial court was correct in directing a verdict for the defendant. *Montgomery, C. J., and Moore, J., dissenting.*

This question has not been decided before in Michigan. The rule was laid down in the Turn Table Cases (*Ry. v. Stout*, 17 Wal. 657) by the United States Court, that where one leaves a dangerous machine exposed so as to tempt children to play with it, it is an implied invitation and owner is liable, has in the present case been repudiated.

Michigan is not alone in taking the other view, in fact several states have refused to follow it. But *Powers v. Harlow*, 53 Mich. 507, cited the Stout Case, *supra*, and strongly hinted that should the question arise it would follow the federal doctrine. The opinion is an excellent digest of the law on the subject.

NUISANCE—COMMON NUISANCE—ABATEMENT.—*STATE V. STARK*, 66 Pac. 243 (Kan.).—On Feb. 17, 1901, in the city of Topeka, the appellant, with Carrie Nation and six others, broke into and injured a billiard hall in connection with which intoxicating liquors were sold. By statute, all places where intoxicating liquors are sold or kept for sale are declared to be common nuisances. The court *held*, however, that this fact does not justify their abatement by any person or persons without process of law.